

Remarks

Claims 23-29 are allowed.

Claims 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Tang, *et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,294,869.

As stated earlier and admitted by the Examiner, Tang, *et al.* never discusses a parallax problem and thus how to solve such problem. It was pointed out in the last reply that the parallax problem becomes important with large-sized substrates, i.e., display panels, for which the present invention is directed. In such larger substrates, the shadow cast by the ribs (walls) is longer for ribs that are farther from the source. Fig. 3 of the specification illustrates the problem. Solution of this problem is illustrated in Fig. 4, whereby the ribs are positioned such that "the pitch of the ribs is smaller than the pitch of the pixel, wherein the pitch of the ribs corrects for parallax in an angle evaporation process.

A distinguishing feature of the present invention is more clearly pointed out by amended claim 30 which provides shadowed regions on a substrate as a result of the above where the source is a finite distance away and provides for such shadow regions to vary in length across the substrate. Support for the amendment can be found at page 9, lines 1-3 of the specification. In Tang, the source is not as such a distance and, therefore, provides parallel beams. Thus, assuming shadowed regions are produced, these do not vary in length across the substrate. This is clearly the reason why Tang never addresses parallax. Comparison of Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 to Tang Figs. 11-14 illustrates the differences. The shadowed regions having variable length across the substrate are part of the device and therefore distinguishable over the Tang device.


In view thereof, Tang does not describe each and every element of the present invention and therefore does not anticipate the present invention as claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 30-32 are now in condition for allowance along with the allowed claims 23-29.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues which may still be outstanding.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/16/04


Ronald A. Daignault
Reg. No. 25,968
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(612) 371-5381